

Our Future Security Environment

-Coalition vs. Non-State Actors or Rogue Nations -

Fumio OTA

Preface

I would like to predict our future security environment. In order to do so, let us review the war history back to about five hundred years ago, at the end of European Medieval period.

Prior to the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648, wars were fought among feudal lords or religious groups. After the Treaty of Westphalia, however, wars were mainly fought between nation states, examples of which include Mexican-American War (1846) in the Western Hemisphere, the Franco-Prussian War (1870) in Europe, and the Sino-Japanese War (1894) in Asia. Owing to the development of diplomatic, trade, and military lines of communication that enhanced state-to-state relations, most wars during the 20th century were fought between alliances, such as World Wars I and II. This phenomenon is due in part to the industrial revolution that created modern weapons. Their requirement for vast amounts of ammunition and energy encouraged many countries to pool their efforts.

In the 21st century, however, we no longer envision another Franco-Prussian War or U.S.-Japanese War. Especially after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, wars have been fought primarily between coalition and non-state actors such as in Afghanistan and in Iraq after the coalition defeated the Iraqi Army, on May 1, 2003. The Iraq War before May 1 and the potential for a future war on the Korean Peninsula or in Iran would be considered to be wars between coalitions and rogue nations. At first look, the India-Pakistan conflict appears as a conventional state vs. state “war”, however, recent examples of conflict there again point to an unconventional conflict between radical Islamic non-state actors pitted against the Indian State. The Israeli—Palestine conflict is another classic example of state against non-state actor. Usually, states desire to maintain the status quo, whereas non-state actors or rogue nations want to achieve their desired end-state by means of promoting turmoil and disturbance.

Report Documentation Page				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE 1997		2. REPORT TYPE N/A		3. DATES COVERED -	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Our Future Security Environment - Coalition vs. Non-State Actors or Rogue Nations -				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) National Defense University Fort McNair Washington, DC 20319				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release, distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT SAR	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 10	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

Another aspect of war in the 21st Century is that after 9-11 must be termed asymmetric warfare. It is true that not only the actors but also the methods employed are unconventional (or. guerrilla warfare) vice conventional. Sun Tzu defined asymmetric warfare as warfare where the “army avoids strength and strikes at weakness.”¹ That does not match the present situation. For example, the U.S. adopted a “competitive strategy” during the Cold War era. This strategy sought to deny the Soviet Union political, economic, and military leverage by exploiting their inherent weakness and emphasizing enduring US strengths across the spectrum of potential conflict.² Therefore, owing to this spectrum of conflict, asymmetric warfare appears even in war between states. Given this background and taking into account historical aspects of war, the current war against terrorism must be characterized as the warfare between coalition and non-state actors or rogue nations.

From Alliance to Coalition of the Willing

American unilateralism coupled with widely different threat perceptions of other countries created the current “coalition of the willing”. Two-coalition that are currently underway in the world are taking place within the U.S. Central Command’s Area of Responsibility (AOR): Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) against Al Qaeda, and the Taliban, and Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF). Other typical examples of U.S.-led coalition efforts are the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI) and Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) network in which countries that have shared national interests, get together for a common and specific purpose. When Admiral Fargo was in command of the U.S. Pacific Command, he initiated the Regional Maritime Security Initiative (RMSI) in March 2004.

Japan and South Korea, who are not allies have cooperated by sharing terrorist intelligence during the Soccer World Cup in 2002 and had also been coordination with each other since March 2002 in the East Timor nation building process.

In Southeast Asia, the U.S. and Philippine Army coalition has been battling against the Abu Sayyaf Group (ASG), and an ASEAN coalition has been combating Jamaa Islamiya (JI) terrorists. During the international response to the December 2004 Tsunami and

¹ Samuel B. Griffith, *Sun Tzu The Art of War*, Oxford University Press, p.101

² The Joint Staff, *United States Military Posture for FY 1989*, p.6

earthquake, the U.S., Japan, Australia and India formed a coalition. Canada and the Netherlands also joined before the recovery effort was eventually taken over by the UN.

It is noteworthy that the Northeast Asian region seems to be an exception to the pattern of 21st century problems. The most likely security problems continue to hinge on the actions of state actors, such as hostilities on the Korea Peninsula or in the Strait of Taiwan.

Why has this phenomenon occurred? Realist theory explains that having won the Cold War, the U.S. has achieved hegemony, and therefore can form coalitions. However, the coalition among Indonesia, Malaysia and Philippines against transnational threats formulated in May 2002 does not include the U.S. Therefore, hegemony theory cannot explain this phenomena. Liberal theory explains that advanced nations are naturally interdependent and form coalitions when challenged by non-state actors or rogue nations. However, countries which are forming these coalitions are not necessarily advanced nations. So, Liberal theory also has some limitations. We can explain these phenomena in terms of the ongoing information revolution. Non-state actors and rogue nations have easily access to WMD technology through internet, and modern computer net-works enable countries to easily formulate coalitions.

Japan has cooperated with other democratic nations beyond the purview of the U.S. Whereas NATO has been expanding its operational area outwards towards the east, into areas such as Afghanistan or Iraq: Japan has been expanding its activities beyond its normal operational area toward the west into the Arabian Sea and Iraq. Previously, NATO issues were beyond the purview of Japan. However, the Japanese Ground Self Defense Force contingent in Iraq has coordinated with Dutch forces in Samawah and now they are cooperating with British and Australian military forces in the Southeast region of Iraq. Moreover, the Japanese Maritime Self Defense ships have supplied oil to many NATO countries and non-NATO countries that are participating in Operation Enduring Freedom such as Pakistan and New Zealand.

• **Changing Command and Control Structure**

During the state to state war period before 20th century, it was inconceivable to

imagine that foreigners could be involved in each nation's military command and control structures. During World War I, however, allied headquarters under the command of French General Ferdinand Foch were established at the Western front in 1918. Though the war was almost over and this headquarters structure was both incomplete and limited, it was a good start on establishing international cooperation through combined military organization. One month after the Pearl Harbor attack, President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill met with their military advisors at the Arcadia Conference in Washington to plan a coordinated effort against the Axis powers. At that time, the two Allied leaders established the Combined Chiefs of Staff (CCS) as the supreme military body for strategic direction of the Anglo-American war effort.³ Then, after the Second World War, NATO was established and exists to this day. Today, in the Information Revolution age, technological and communications breakthroughs cross national borders so fast that those military institutions themselves become virtually borderless. After the 9-11 terrorist attack, OEF and OIF coalition villages were created. Under the U.S. Central Command, CJTF-7 transformed into Multinational Force-Iraq (MNF-I) on May 15 2004. These phenomena demonstrate that in today's world to be effective military forces must be able and willing to work with other militaries and that means command and control must be integrated.

Shifting Strategy

Immediately following the 9-11 terrorist attacks, the U.S. Quadrennial Defense Review Report issued in September 2001 stated that a central objective of the review was to shift the basis of defense planning from a "threat-based" model that had dominated thinking in the past to a "capabilities-based" model for the future.⁴ Now it is also apparent that a deterrent strategy is not effective against non-state threats like suicide bombers. Therefore, the concept of preemptive action is emerging. The National Security Strategy of the United States of America issued in September 2002, stated, "To forestall or prevent such hostile acts by our adversaries, the United States will, if necessary, act preemptively."⁵ The concept of preemption is not uniquely American: Israel made a preemptive attack on the Iraqi Osirak nuclear facility in 1981. A French government document issued in January

³ *The Joint Staff Officer's Guide 2000, JFSC Pub 1*, p.1-19

⁴ Quadrennial Defense Review Report, Department of Defense, September 30, 2001, p.iv

⁵ The National Security Strategy of the United States of America, The White House, September 2002, p.9

2003 for its 2003-2008 military program addressed preemption as well: “We must...be prepared to identify and forestall threats as soon as possible. In this context, the possibility of preemptive action might be considered, from the time that an explicit and confirmed threatening situation is identified.”⁶ Australian Prime Minister John Howard stated that he would launch a pre-emptive strike against terrorists in another country if he had evidence they were about to attack Australia.⁷ Russian Defense Minister, Sergei B. Ivanov mentioned at the “Emergency Issues” conference that “if Russian interests or its alliance duty is needed, we will not exclude the possibility of preventive use of military force at all.”⁸ Right after the school hostage crisis of North Ossetia in September 2004, Chief of General Staff, General Yury Baluyevsky stated “As for making pre-emptive strikes at terrorist bases, we will make every effort to liquidate bases in any region of the world.”⁹ Even PLAAF LTG Zheng Shenxia has noted that without adopting a pre-emptive doctrine, the chances of a PLA victory are limited.¹⁰

International Law is Limiting

Hugo Grotius, a 17th century Dutch jurist, developed the concept of international law. However, current international law, only defines relations between states and is mute on how to solve issues with non-state actors like Al Qaeda. The U.S. is presently detaining Al Qaeda fighters in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. Should we treat those non-state actors as Prisoners Of War (POW), a status defined by the international law? Of course, non-state actors historically fail to recognize international law.

Article 51 of the current Charter of the United Nations states “Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security.” Since the Charter uses the present tense “occurs”, preemptive action conflicts with the traditional concept of the right

⁶ LOI 2003-73 du 27 janvier 2003

⁷ Interviewed by Catherine McGrath, December 1, 2002

⁸ Vladimir Mukhim, “Preventivnyi undar ot Ivanova,” *Nezavisimaya Gazeta*, October 3, 2003

⁹ <http://www.crosswalk.com/news/1283892.html>

¹⁰ Annual Report on The Military Power of the People’s Republic of China, July 2002, U.S Department of Defense, p.14

of self-defense under current International Law. However, many countries are considering the preemptive action as I stated previously.

The Declaration on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among State in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations issued on October 24, 1970 states: “*The principle concerning the duty not to intervene in matters within the domestic jurisdiction of any state, in accordance with the Charter*; No state or group of states has the right to intervene directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State.” However, the United State’s attacked on Afghanistan in 2001, and Russia may launch an attack in Pankisi valley of Georgia in the name of self defense. Georgia, an independent state is problematic for applying non-intervention principle. However, Afghanistan before OEF or Somalia were failed states, so it is questionable whether or not the principle of “non-intervention” applies.

Finally, the Law of Naval Warfare does not define non-state actors that are criminals: such as in the case of maritime terrorism and piracy.

The Changing Nature of War

Up until the 19th century, total available manpower was the decisive factor in determining military strength. In the 20-century industrial power determined military strength. Today, the power afforded by information is decisive in combat operations. Just before the year 2000, U.S. Navy Admiral Jay L. Johnson, who was then Chief of Naval Operations, stated “...it’s a fundamental shift from what we call platform centric warfare to something we call network centric warfare.” Of course, this “information power” ranges from the strategic to the tactical, as this information includes target data installed on Precision Guided Munitions (PGM) warheads.

This leads to the question- in the war against terrorism, what is the objective? In war between state actors, territory has traditionally been the first objective. During the Mexican-American war in 1846, the American war objectives were to obtain California and Arizona. During the Franco-Prussian War in 1870, the Prussian war objectives were to obtain the Ardennes and Lorraine. After the Sino-Japanese War in 1894, Japan obtained

Taiwan and the Liaodong Peninsula: which were eventually brought back to China due to German, France and Russian intervention. In alliance warfare however, war objective had more to do with ideology or system than territory as evidenced by the democratic countries during World War II and the Western Camp during the Cold War. Similarly, in the war between coalition and non-state actors in the war on terrorism, the objective is personal security and freedom from tyranny.

War between coalition and non-state actors tends to be prolonged war while wars between states are often of shorter duration. State to state wars during the 18th and 19th centuries lasted several months. In the 20th century, both World Wars I and II lasted four years. The war against terrorism is expected to take more than ten years. The key difference is that opponents in conventional war are state actors, and hence, capable of conducting and honoring negotiations. Non-state actors, however, are diplomatically invisible, and by their nature cannot negotiate. They are also highly resistant to maneuver and other “conventional” methods of diplomatic manipulation. Conducting anti-terrorism warfare is like trying to control traffic accidents; we cannot eliminate them completely but can reduce them to only a certain level by making continuous efforts.

In the wars between nation-states in the 18th and 19th centuries, casualties usually mounted to several thousands, though it depended on the size of the conflict. In wars fought among alliances during the 20th century, millions of people were killed. In the current war against terrorism, casualties have been a few thousand so far, however, that could be expanded several fold if the terrorists obtain and use Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD).

In order to fight non-state actors, the forces cannot be limited to soldiers but must also include policemen, customs officers, and sometimes financial institutions as well. Therefore, inter-agency efforts assume a much greater importance than during the state-to-state war period. The mission of the Armed Forces has become not simply to destroy the enemy but to do it in the context of the more limited means encompassed in the term Military Operation Other Than War (MOOTW).

Military Requirements are Changing

Military transformation is ongoing. Massive single-purpose weapons are being replaced by smaller, faster, more mobile, flexible, quick responsive and multi-purposed weapons. Many countries, including NATO, have created quick response forces. Not restricted to weapon systems, military transformation has included review of overseas basing posture. The basic idea of American Global Posture Review, issued in November 2003 was the notion of flexibility to deal with uncertainty, to include expeditionary aspects by focusing on qualitative military power vice mere quantitative orders of battle.¹¹

Before the Treaty of Westphalia warriors were recruited through a mercenary system; however, during the Napoleonic Wars of the 18th and early 19th centuries, nations developed national armies and conscription. Worldwide, the draft system has become unpopular. Based on the 15 NATO countries in 1988, there were only four volunteer system countries (U.S., Canada, Luxembourg, and UK). By 2003 the number had grown to 8 (now including Belgium, France, Netherlands, and Spain), and is expected to be 10 with Italy and Portugal joining the trend in 2006. Use of Special Forces has been expanding. The Australian Defense Review in 2003 stated, “The Government has already decided to implement a number of measures as a result of Australia’s new strategic environment. These measures include increasing the size of our Special Forces including the establishment of a Special Operations Command.”¹²

Finally, reliable and multi-sourced intelligence is critical. On the article “21st Century War”, Lieutenant General Bruce Carlson, 8th Air Force Commander said “We’ve fought several successful coalition wars, but we’ve not successfully demonstrated that we can share information with a coalition partner the way we need to.”¹³ However, progress is being made. Now, OIF and OEF coalition groups are sharing intelligence through secure net-works. Human intelligence, considered to be of lesser importance by some during the Cold War, has now again been recognized as important in order to cope with terrorist attacks. The Council on Security and Defense Capabilities Report- Japan’s Vision for Future Security and Defense Capabilities- issued in October 2004 stated “There is also a growing need to counter the new, externally unrecognizable threats posed by non-state

¹¹ Department of Defense, *Global Posture Review (Background Brief)*, November 25, 2003

¹² *Australia’s National Security Defense Update 2003*, p24

¹³ David A. Fulghum, *21st Century War*, Aviation Week & Space Technology/April 26, 2004, p.51

actors through first-hand human intelligence. Consequently, the government should promptly take steps to fully exploit human intelligence resources, including area study specialists and overseas intelligence experts.”¹⁴ The 911 Commission Report issued in October 2004, recommended that the CIA Director should emphasize transforming its clandestine service by building its human intelligence capabilities.¹⁵ And, the U.S. Defense Intelligence Agency changed the name of the Directorate for Intelligence Operations into the Directorate for HUMINT in April 2003.

• Conclusion

Military Balance 2004-2005 stated that the only major populated region in which transnational Islamist terrorists have not appeared heavily active is East Asia.¹⁶ Japan has not yet been attacked by radical transnational Islamic terrorists. A few Japanese citizens who were involved in 9-11 and in Bali Island in Indonesia or in Iraq have been killed. By the end of 2004, however, on six occasions Islamic radicals have announced that Japan would be the subject of a terrorist attack.¹⁷ Not limited to foreign-born terrorists, Japanese citizens have already suffered from chemical attacks by non-state actors, the Aum Shinrikyo in 1995. In order to cope with these non-state threats, Japan must fight against terrorism as part of an international coalition. The U.S.-Japan alliance fostered in last fifty years should be the basis for these coalitions. Moreover, it is time to transform the U.S.-Japan alliance from one based on only “defense of Japan” or “situations in areas surrounding Japan” into one focused more on Japan’s global role. On this occasion, we must cooperate with other democratic countries.

¹⁴ The Council on Security and Defense Capabilities, *The Council on Security and Defense Capabilities Report- Japan’s Vision for Future Security and Defense Capabilities*, October 2004, p.16

¹⁵ Department of Defense, *The 9/11 Quadrennial Defense Review Report*, September 30, 2001, p38

¹⁶ International Institute for Strategic Studies, *Military Balance 2004-2005*, October 2004, p.385

¹⁷ 18 Oct. ‘03 (UBL), 16 Nov. ‘03 (AQ Senior Member, Abu Muhammad Abu Raji), 11 Mar. ‘04 (Abu Hafs Al Masri Brigade), 18 Mar ‘04 (Abu Hafs Al Masri Brigade), 07 May ‘04 (UBL), 01 Oct. ‘04 (Aiman Zawahiri)

Retired Vice Admiral and Dr. Fumio OTA is a former Director of Defense Intelligence Headquarters in Japan Defense Agency and is currently, the Director of the Center for Security and Crisis Management Education at the National Defense Academy.